DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 237 006 HE 016 783

AUTHOR	Brown, Peggy, Ed.
TITLE	[Institutional Renewal].
INSTITUTION	Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Nov 83
NOTE	21p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Association of American Colleges, 1818 R Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20009.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
JOURNAL CIT	Forum for Liberal Education; v6 n2 Nov-Dec 1983
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Programs; *Computer Assisted Instruction; *Consultation Programs; Core Curriculum; Degree Requirements; Departments; Educational Change; Faculty Evaluation; *General Education; Higher Education; Honors Curriculum; Humanities; *Liberal Arts; Microcomputers; Nontraditional Education; Professional Continuing Education; Program Descriptions; Technical Assistance; Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS	Allentown College of Saint Francis de Sales PA; Appalachian State University NC; Augsburg College MN; Bard College NY; College of Mount Saint Vincent NY; College of Saint Catherine MN; Consultation and Advisory Services Project; *Institutional Renewal; Pace University NY; Project Lodestar; University of Michigan Flint; University of Tennessee; University of Wyoming

ABSTRACT

The theme of this journal issue is "Institutional Renewal." Projects designed to address the issues of the 1980s at 18 colleges are described, and 15 definitions of institutional renewal are presented. Participating colleges were provided expert advice through the Association of American College's (AAC) Project Lodestar (renamed Consultation and Advisory Services Project). The following college projects are described: implementing new general education requirements (University of Michigan-Flint); a 3-week mandatory nonremedial writing program (Bard College); attracting top liberal arts students (Pace University); restructuring college honors (University of Wyoming); making room for nontraditional liberal arts programs (University of Tennessee); evaluating general education (Allentown College of St. Francis de Sales); creating faculty review procedures (Appalachian State University); making changes (Augsburg College); strengthening the humanities (College of Mount Saint Vincent); planning departmental reviews (College of St. Catherine); new insights on established courses (Davidson College); faculty and microcomputers (Emmanuel College); faculty members as liberal learners (Ithaca College); building a core (Marymount College); liberal arts goals (Mater Dei College); maximizing the faculty and curriculum (Merrimack College); integrating computers and humanities (Seton Hall University); general education for professionals (Widener University). (SW)

ED237006

The forum FOR LIBERAL EDUCATION

VOL. 6, NO. 2 NOVEMBER/DECEMBER 1983

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AAC

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

IE 016 723

aac Association of American Colleges

The forum
FOR LIBERAL EDUCATION

November/December 1983
Volume 6, Number 2

Defining Institutional Renewal 2

The University of Michigan-Flint
Implementing New General Education Requirements 6

Bard College
Writing Up a Storm 7

Pace University
Attracting Top Liberal Arts Students 8

University of Wyoming
Restructuring College Honors 10

University of Tennessee
Making Room for Nontraditional Liberal Arts Programs 11

Allentown College of St. Francis de Sales
Evaluating General Education 12

Additional Programs 13

Editor
Peggy Brown

Research Assistant
Tina Adler

This issue was made possible by a grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.

Cover photo courtesy of the University of Kansas University Archives.

Published six times during the academic year by the Association of American Colleges. *Forum* is available for $18 per academic year for persons at AAC member institutions and $24 for all others. Multiple copy rates available. ISSN 0734-9793.

©1983 by the Association of American Colleges, 1818 R St. NW, Washington, D.C. 20009. 202/387-3760.

AAC's Project Lodestar

The 18 colleges and universities described in this issue were all part of AAC's Project Lodestar during the 1981-82 or 1982-83 academic years. Funded since 1979 by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, Lodestar helps faculty and administrators address the issues of the 1980s and beyond. By providing 50 percent of the consultation costs, Lodestar (recently renamed the Consultation and Advisory Services Project) allows AAC member institutions to receive expert advice on a wide range of concerns.

In thinking about a title for this issue I chose "institutional renewal," because everyone knows what that means and few people are familiar with Project Lodestar. Suddenly it struck me: do I *really* know what institutional renewal means? Deciding it was time to clarify this bit of academic rhetoric, I asked 25 persons familiar with higher education to define institutional renewal. Fifteen responded; their replies follow. *P.B.*

Defining Institutional Renewal

To define institutional renewal begs the question of what a college or university was like when it was new. Although there are as many answers to this as institutions, there is a configuration of qualities that characterize new colleges and universities.

They know what they are about and have a vision that animates their being.
They have a program consciously designed to serve those purposes.
They are staffed by administrators and faculty members purposefully selected to carry out the program.
They have a student clientele that is served by the program and staff.
They have the resources necessary to do the job.

Although not all new colleges or universities possess all of these qualities, they are a pretty solid staple of most.

Over time an institution acquires something it never had at the outset—a history. With the passage of time purposes tend to become less clear and new ones added. Original leaders and staff may depart and others arrive, sometimes with their own agendas for the institution. The clientele may change, or its interests may shift. And resources may dry up, or new sources tapped, either of which may distort the original plan.

The renewal of an institution involves putting all of these pieces together again. But this is a very different matter than starting afresh, because the institution now has a life of its own—a history, traditions, interest groups, and an established financial base. Renewal involves changing established patterns, a difficult and uphill struggle at best. In so doing, it also involves capturing something else that typically is lost to history—enthusiasm, energy, and commitment. Commitment to a vision of an institution that is devoted to valued ends and consistently organized to serve them in the contemporary context.

Today we face a serious task as our institutions become larger and more differentiated. Most faculty members have come to believe that they are hired by their departments, to serve their departments, and are rewarded, promoted, and protected by their departments. The result is a dispersal of authority, contradictory purposes, and lack of coherence, which has caused the academy to be called an "organized anarchy."

The fact is that academics, unlike practitioners of the medical or legal profession, for example, cannot hang up their shingle and set up shop. Most are able to practice their specialty only within the context of an institution of higher learning. Individual specialists are only as strong as their institution. This is a tie that binds all groups within the institution. As the academy looks ahead toward several lean years, it is apparent that all groups, departments or otherwise, must once again search for the common ground. In short, economic necessity stimulates institutions to renew

themselves by reaffirming, resurrecting or creating a common vision, deciding which programs serve agreed-upon purposes, developing appropriate staff, serving the key clientele, and utilizing available resources. Renew or else! That is the challenge facing most colleges and universities today.

Jerry Gaff, Dean, College of Liberal Arts
Hamline University

To hear some people tell it, the mission of higher education is changing . . . institutions must renew themselves to take account of a new age. Computers and technology are in. The liberal arts are out.

There is no shortage of boosters for this version of institutional renewal. Fierce competition for freshmen and a tight job market for graduates provide a persuasive argument in behalf of this view. Perhaps my glasses are smudged, but I see it differently.

Despite the Star Wars scenario for the 21st century—when today's undergraduates will reach their prime—the path to a full and satisfying life is not likely to shift. And the elements of a worthwhile education will remain essentially the same.

What institutional renewal ought to mean is a rededication to an undergraduate education that helps people live complete lives. Shakespeare and Freud are not going to become obsolete. Learning the lessons of history will not be wasted. Being able to reason and to organize one's ideas will remain invaluable.

There is, of course, room for improvement in helping students become conversant in science and less anxious about mathematics. And there is the opportunity to employ the computer as a tool to learning, just as the library is already used. But this does not imply an upheaval in the curriculum.

If anything, institutional renewal means nurturing the rich soil in which the liberal arts are planted, strengthening the roots of a solid education, not ripping them from the ground.

Gene Maeroff, Education Writer
The New York Times

To the student of literature, the term 'renewal' inevitably summons Ezra Pound's "Make it new"—the call to revolutionary expression that helped create the modernist movement. Institutional renewal in a college or university, however, is precisely *not* revolution, but rather a process of reinvigoration, refreshment from the springs of its energy. Renewal is the opposite of drift or, worse, a smug, Candidean assertion of the timeless correctness of prevailing assumptions.

The college that seeks renewal will first locate firmly the tradition from which it arose and has derived its strength—in Warren Bennis's terms, "the myth of the institution," the saga of its significance to its graduates and its community over time. Then, in a thorough, clear-eyed examination of its instructional, research, and service enterprises, the college will connect its educational tradition and evolving strengths to the pressing questions not just of our time but of the century soon to come. If its educational programs have helped its graduates find satisfying, reflective lives, such connections *can* be found. (If they cannot, renewal is not possible; the college should confront the painful possibility of dignified closure and dispersal of its resources in a fashion that honors the integrity of its charter.)

By clarifying and focusing on the programs central to its academic identity—and, as necessary, de-emphasizing or even eliminating others—the college will simultaneously define the students best able to profit from its offerings and contribute to its community; no university can *really* teach "any person . . . any subject." Such renewal might well yield reorganization: of the patterns that shape curricula, of the administrative structures (and perhaps personnel) that serve and deliver programs, of the budgets that assert institutional priorities.

Renewal is 'institutional' because it must be undertaken as a joint effort by all those with responsibility for defining the college's purposes. It involves the faculty, who develop and present academic programs that draw upon the college's wellsprings. It involves the governing board, whose members review, query pointedly, and ultimately give their *imprimatur* to those programs. It involves, in the usual euphemism, "leadership": the president and chief academic officer who must at first inspire and ultimately articulate the renewed common vision. They bear responsibility for expressing the college's identity anew with *and* to its faculty, whose commitment and high morale are essential; to potential applicants, in publications that are not "marketing" devices but depictions of the college's best aspirations for itself and its students; and to the constituents both public and private whose confidence and support buoy the college's future. To this thoughtful articulation of continuity within change Pound's advice may in fact apply: "Make it new!"

Linda B. Salamon, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
Washington University in St. Louis

In one sense an institution is always changing, solving problems, surviving crises, and being involved in helpful activities such as the Lodestar program. This is living and changing to improve and survive but lacks some of the essential ingredients of institutional renewal. Renewal is more than change, specific problem solving, or institutional band-aids. Circumstances that require a serious new look and provide a local consensus for institutional renewal are prerequisites if it is to be successful.

Institutional renewal is intentional; it is holistic and future-oriented in concept, application, and analysis. It is systematic and inclusive in process and participation. It starts with the review of the basic mission of the institution, its constituency and their needs, and proceeds to see how these future needs may be met. It must be clear from the beginning where the authority for making decisions lies. A newness potential is envisioned for what the institution could be like at some future date (10-20 yrs.) before facing the practical steps of moving the institution from its present situation to the future goals. Institutional renewal may be done as a crisis with an all-out effort. A better way is to build in attitudes and approaches for a cycle system of procedures that continually reviews and renews the institution. This would enable the institution to achieve its goals with efficiency and effectiveness and to meet the needs of the fast-changing society.

John D. Moseley*, President Emeritus of Austin College
Senior Partner of Management and Renewal
Consulting Services

A cynic might define institutional renewal as "pushing paper around." You eliminate campus policies and regulations which everyone ignores, and replace them with other policies and regulations which elicit tremendous bursts of rhetoric but which soon lapse into the same neglect that their predecessors enjoyed. Some changes in academe are indeed managed in this fashion.

But individuals, departments, and entire colleges also make real and far-reaching changes. My own experience is in general education. Revision of general education qualifies as institutional renewal because you are talking about courses which *all* students will be taking—if you are serious about it, that is.

In my visits to numerous colleges over recent years, I have seen general education revision that was totally motivated by external developments and pressures: "It's the way to get grants;" "We're the last ones in the State to get in on this;" "We'll lose positions in these departments if we don't get a bigger slice of the general ed. pie!" And I have seen—and respect infinitely more—general education revision sparked by a genuine collec-

tive concern to wrestle with what really is the core and center of an undergraduate degree from *this* (or "our") college. What is at work here is internally motivated; it is a concern for institutional identity and mission. That may seem bland and obvious, but it is true experientially. The "obvious" organic connection between overall institutional mission and general education is frequently "obviously" ignored.

My formula for institutional renewal?—hard-nosed realism coupled with misty-eyed idealism . . .

John Nichols,* Core Curriculum Coordinator
St. Joseph's College

Over the years, as I moved about from one assignment to another, I saw small institutions that were sick and large complex ones that were vital and exciting. Slowly, the obvious began to dawn: the vitality of a campus has little to do with whether the place is large or small, public or private, rich or poor. Rather, institutional health is to be measured by the attitudes of those who come together every day to perform tasks under the banner of the institution. There is, I concluded, no such thing as *institutional* renewal; there is only *people* renewal.

My conviction on this matter deepened when I became Chancellor of the State University of New York. My candid, hard-bitten colleagues told me SUNY could, in no way, be considered a *uni*-versity. This complex, multi-campus system was, they said, only a sprawling collection of independent feifdoms with no connecting tissue. The charge was disturbing. Was there, in fact, such a thing as SUNY? If so, how could it be defined?

There were legal statutes, to be sure, that named the State University of New York. But it seemed clear to me that SUNY existed primarily in the heads of people, held together by the attitudes of students, faculty, and administrators who were spread from Fredonia in the west to Stony Brook on Long Island. If SUNY was to work, people must *think* State University of New York; they must feel that it was, in fact, something greater than the separate parts.

To a large degree every institution is a state of mind. It succeeds or fails depending on the attitudes of people. This means, to return to our central theme, that to renew a college is to renew the people who are there. It means finding fresh ways to improve the way they think about the place and their role within it.

It means helping students, faculty, and administrators share common goals, feel good about those purposes, believe they can be accomplished, and then find ways to recognize and reward individuals for a job well done.

As people think, they act. And, in the end, institutional behavior, just like personal behavior, is shaped largely by the visions in our head.

Ernest L. Boyer, President
The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

The institutional renewal process is actually one of self-renewal and comes from the people in the institution—its administrative leadership, its faculty and staff, and the students it serves.

There are no quick and easy answers as to how an institution can be characterized by self-renewal, but the following guidelines may be useful. First, there must be widespread understanding, clarity and ownership of the enterprise. The persons in the organization need to understand the goals and objectives of the institution and commit themselves to their accomplishment. Such commitment can only occur where there is reasonable congruence between the goals of the institution and those of the staff.

Second, individuals in the college need to be held accountable for their best efforts in carrying out their agreed upon responsibilities. Each person really does have talents which, when acknowledged, valued and channeled appropriately, can contribute to institutional effectiveness.

Third, the structure and environment of the organization must provide an appropriate blend of challenge and support, to use Nevitt Sanford's helpful phrase. Each of us has an apparently innate need to grow and to be challenged. In responding to challenge, people cannot only contribute to the goals of the organization but also have a sense of personal accomplishment. Along with this stimulus for challenge, there needs to be an adequate amount of support provided to people in the organization, and that includes those in leadership positions as well as members of the staff.

Fourth, the interaction of persons in the institution should exemplify the mission and values of the college. That is to say, people should be valued as persons and work should be carried out in ways that recognize individual differences, foster personal autonomy and promote what Yankelovich has called an ethic of relationship.

There is a Quaker saying that I like a lot: "living with intentionality." While no institution is always characterized fully by the guidelines suggested here, it may well be that clear, intentional efforts to promote them in our colleges can help us all contribute to the creation of more effective, self-renewing institutions.

Charles S. Claxton, Associate Professor
Center for the Study of Higher Education
Memphis State University

Lucretius wrote in *On the Nature of Things*, "Thus the sum of things is ever being renewed, and mortals live dependent one upon another. Some nations increase, others diminish, and in short space the generation of living creatures are changed and like rumors pass on the torch of life."

Our colleges and universities must provide the training and development of our future leaders in business, science, government, and academia. To meet this vital challenge, institutions of higher education should continually renew themselves through perpetual cycles of growth, development, and change. To stay in the vanguard of progress, it is imperative for our systems of education to continually focus on the development, communication, and utilization of knowledge.

T. H. Bell, Secretary
U.S. Department of Education

As a humanist, my first reaction to the term institutional renewal is that it is an illegitimate transfer of meaning from the individual to the organizational realm. Our traditional concepts and ceremonies of renewal pertain to the individual: rebirth, recognition of altered roles and circumstances, repentance and redemption. For the most part, these notions arose when the individual was considered to be immortal and institutions to be in constant danger of degeneration. It is a point of anthropological curiosity whether individual renewal functioned to interrupt the tedium of individual immortality or to construct that assumption by masking and inverting the felt but inadmissible decline toward death.

Modern culture has reversed the values assigned to individuals and institutions. It accepts, abstractly at least, individual mortality but it expects that institutions will persist to inherit our children. From this perspective the term institutional renewal provokes a second reaction. I recall Hannah Arendt's celebration of theivity and power that attended the founders of our national government as they framed a new order in the world. American political institutions have tapped a unique vitality by reenacting that creative moment with the periodic inauguration of a new President. By contrast, our institutions of higher education—whose graduations and degrees provide

one of our society's most important forms of individual renewal—do not themselves carry out formal renewal.

I know that some aspects of higher education should be constant rather than periodically renewed. A steady flow of investment is necessary to maintain both facilities and human skills. But elsewhere we need periodically to tap vitality and creativity like that experienced in the 1960s when we launched new institutions, new departments, and new programs.

Institutional purposes gradually lose touch with changes and opportunities in the surrounding social environment. Within institutions, activities and structures tend to become detached from purposes and to become ends in themselves. Perhaps the most critical need is both individual and institutional. The large number of people who attained now scarce permanent faculty positions in the last fifteen or twenty years will be in those positions for a long time to come. The prospect of continuing to do for another twenty years what one already has been doing for a very long time can lead to a discouraging sense of relentless interminability.

As an administrator, I know that institutional renewal must involve a detailed program of practical changes. But, as a humanist, I hope that institutional renewal can also mean something, that it can provide the occasion for desperately desired individual renewal.

James Herbert, Director of Academic Relations
The College Board

I think of institutional renewal as very like a remarriage ceremony. A man and woman say to one another—despite and perhaps because of the many changes each has made over the years—"I still love you and want to spend my life with you." This rededication and recommitment to one another is prompted by the changed circumstances and purposes of their lives together. It is probably not *necessary* since many couples do not informally or formally so declare themselves—and yet, it is a powerful symbolic ritual.

So it is with institutional renewal. It is a time to reexamine institutional mission and purpose, and for the *people* in an institution to recommit to this purpose.

As the words imply, institutional renewal is the *re*birth, *re*generation, *re*vitalization and *re*juvenation of an institution, its people, and its structure. A key thought here is the prefix "re." It is the *cycling* of growth with stability (freezing with unfreezing with *re*freezing a la Lewin) which enables an institution to experience a sense of progress and adaptation to a changing world—in other words, to institutionalize a continuing capacity to change to new demands.

Karen Watkins, Lecturer
Adult, Higher & Continuing Education, University of Texas
Editor, Innovation Abstracts

The term institutional renewal, tossed around frequently these days, reflects society's preoccupation with newness. No one would pay much attention to the phrases "institutional renovation" or "institutional rebirth," but "new" stops traffic. When sales of a product on the market begin to drop, adding "New!" to the label boosts them up again. The same principle applies when the product happens to be a college or university.

For an institution genuinely seeking renewal of its product and not just more attractive packaging and labeling, there must be rigorous self-scrutiny and honest self-evaluation of everything necessary to ensure that institution's vitality.

In many cases, renewal will mean *growth*—not just in enrollments or funding, but in the ability to adapt to a new clientele and society. Courage will be needed to face difficult questions and to avoid the natural inclination to cling to old, familiar operations. In other cases, renewal will mean *rejuvenation*—a total transformation, rebirth, new lease on life—a "making new again." In still others, there will be *reaffirmation* of missions and programs that stand the test of time. Renewal need not be synonymous with change; it can also entail a return to basics or a repetition of what works. Institutions taking this route recognize that newness should not be valued for its own sake.

Regardless of the way in which it was achieved, renewal fosters *health*. An institution may be continuously healthy, a thriving community perennially successful in its mission. Institutional renewal should not be merely a once-a-decade spot remedy for low enrollment, but an ongoing, uninterrupted campaign for excellence.

Joanne L. Erickson, Editor, Educational Record
American Council on Education

Institutional renewal suggests comprehensive revitalization which may include reinvigoration of the curriculum, faculty, staff, physical plant, or all facets of the institution. The impetus may be changed circumstance or extended malaise culminating in a conscious decision to change the institution's course to ensure continuing vitality.

Brooklyn College's experiences demonstrate that recommitment to institutional purpose is possible. Faced with declining enrollments and a fragmented curriculum, administrators became committed to regaining national preeminence in liberal arts education by restoring a college-wide core curriculum. The large cadre of self-styled "born again" professors produced by ongoing discussions of content and technique clearly prove that institutional renewal can become as contagious as apathy, cynicism, or despair. Improvement of the physical and cultural ambience beyond the classroom transcended symbol to become complements to the academic program.

True renewal requires a clear sense of identity and timely strategic intervention. The renaissance of teaching and learning at Brooklyn College owes its genesis to a deliberate faculty revitalization program generated by the decision to mount a common core and to stimulate coherence in the total academic program. After all, the heart of any educational institution is its academic program, and the key to institutional renewal resides in its resuscitation.

Ethyle R. Wolfe, Provost and
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Brooklyn College

What is sometimes called institutional renewal doesn't deserve the name. It is not new patches of curriculum here and there, nor a new institutional theme announced by leadership, nor a new public relations pitch that seems so prevalent in higher education today. It is much more. Its essential ingredients are: a redefinition of institutional goals, usually starting with the president after consultation with the academic leadership; a wide dissemination to the faculty of the economic and academic problems and possibilities the institution faces; a plan to align resources, scholarly and financial, in reshaping instruction and research to the new goals; and incentives to members of the academic community as well as to outside donors to invest themselves in the renewed vitality and mission of the institution.

Without comprehensive approaches to development for colleges and universities, their future will come to be shaped by pressures rather than planning, by everyday forces rather than foresight, by drift rather than direction.

Without including each of the essential ingredients for change the best of intended renewals can founder. As Richard Cyert of Carnegie-Mellon said in an American Council on Education workshop, "Planning works best when it has been shaped to a great extent by the faculty. However, there will be no

planning at all without discipline being imposed upon the organization from a central source. Nobody likes to plan. . . . Thus, the planning process must be initiated from the president's office."

What should be added, however, is that faculty who may suffer malaise or anxiety with shifting student study interests, financial problems, and future uncertainties, can be invigorated by being enlisted in the shaping of their institution's, and thus their own, future.

Stanley F. Paulson, Dean, College of the Liberal Arts
The Pennsylvania State University

What does institutional renewal mean? Everything and/or nothing, depending on the circumstances! At its best, it means an intentional effort to evaluate and improve upon institutional program, procedure, or policy by bringing together external resource persons and institutional personnel. The consultations I know best were conducted in independent residential liberal arts colleges with religious ties. All the projects were born both of necessity and of some desire to see institutional growth continue. All were administratively initiated. And all the consultations involved faculty and administration. The most successful were those timed properly to meet a specific need, those attracting faculty and administration support and commitment, and those not circumscribed by imposed boundaries, limits, or outcomes.

Is institutional renewal important? If it means an intention to keep thinking about growth and change, then it is hard to think of an institution where it is not important. Educational institutions are in a paradoxical situation. They face a new climate which necessitates creative response, and they experience institutional instincts to preserve, and to proceed with utmost caution. My hunch is that the educational future belongs to those institutions willing to take some imaginative steps without losing the qualities which have served their success.

Glenn R. Bucher,* Lincoln Professor of Religion
The College of Wooster

Institutional renewal is that process by which a college or university continually makes those changes, adjustments, and reaffirmations necessary to allow it to carry out its mission in a lively, positive manner.

Institutional renewal requires: (1) a clear understanding of mission to help guide the renewal process; (2) a clear sense of a long-range strategic vision in order to make sure the direction of renewal is clear; (3) good constant communication so that mission, vision, and renewal activities are understood and shared; (4) good management and budgeting that raises questions of priority and leaves room for responses to new challenges (i.e., funds are set aside specifically for renewal activities and meeting new challenges); (5) an atmosphere of "expectations" that encourages people (especially faculty and staff) continually to improve and renew themselves; (6) a set of policies and programs which aid personal renewal; and (7) a positive attitude on the campus, fostered by the leadership, that reinforces the idea that renewal is important for the whole institution and for the individuals who are called to carry out institutional renewal.

William C. Nelsen,* President
Augustana College

*Lodestar consultant

The University of Michigan-Flint

Implementing New General Education Requirements

During the last decade the University of Michigan-Flint has witnessed a steady increase in the number of students pursuing professional degrees. Although 86 percent of the credits are still earned in the College of Arts and Sciences, which provides general education courses for all students, professional programs are attracting a growing number of undergraduates, according to Gregory Waters, director of graduate and special programs. As a result, faculty members and administrators wanted to be certain that the general education program was preparing students for a lifetime of learning, not just equipping them for specific careers.

"We recognized that it was time to take another look at the general education requirements and have a clearer understanding of what we were trying to accomplish," says Waters. "The program should reflect both our professional growth and our urban environment."

In spring 1981 the university applied to Project Lodestar for assistance in developing and implementing a revised general education program. During the 1981-82 academic year Lodestar consultant Willard Enteman, provost at Rhode Island College, helped an ad hoc committee devise specific requirements to fulfill the general education guidelines already approved by the faculty. AAC renewed the Lodestar grant for the 1982-83 academic year in order to provide further consultation on the implementation of the new requirements.

Waters characterizes the project's first year as a time of planning and discussion. Enteman and the ad hoc committee, composed of representatives from the college (as well as nonvoting members from the nursing program and the School of Management), began by establishing a timeline for what had to be accomplished by March 1982, the time when the committee had to present the new requirements for faculty consideration. The committee first solicited faculty members' ideas and opinions. Combining this information with their own proposals, they prepared requirements which built on the campus' historical commitment to arts and sciences and responded to the new professional students, says Waters. On April 1 the faculty approved the new requirements.

Similar to the old general education program, the new requirements follow a distribution pattern. A major difference is the careful attention given to the rationale for each requirement. Students entering the university in spring 1983 must now complete 50 credits in English composition, fine arts, humanities, natural sciences, social sciences, and area options—courses grouped under the topics analytic reasoning, values inquiry, the foundations of Western civilization, cultural studies, and foreign language.

The next step was deciding which courses would satisfy the new requirements. On Enteman's advice, administrators gave this responsibility to the college's standing curriculum committee. His rationale for this change in committees was the need to institutionalize the revision process.

Each member of the committee chaired a subcommittee on one of the new requirements, including each of the area options. They invited departments to submit courses which they felt were appropriate for specific requirements. Whether the courses were existing, revised, or new offerings, the departments had to prepare a rationale for how each course fit into the new requirements. In some of the more controversial cases, the subcommittees requested syllabi, textbooks, and examinations to aid in the screening process.

After announcing the results of their deliberations, the curriculum committee gave departments another opportunity to present their case for particular courses. They distributed their revised proposals and sponsored open hearings on their decisions. During the second year faculty members met with colleagues in their own departments, as well as with those in other departments and the professional programs.

In the course of the discussions, administrators realized that the student services offices needed to be involved in the implementation process. "They were not objecting to the changes but needed to be kept informed," says Waters. Student services handles advising, certification of students for graduation, and ties with area feeder schools. To help Waters decide what needed to be done in this area, AAC asked Mark Smith, dean of students at Eckerd College, to join the Lodestar advisory team. Smith met with the student services personnel and recommended ways to keep communication channels open.

In March 1983 the faculty approved the initial course selection. Waters emphasizes that this will be an ongoing process. In addition, the curriculum committee anticipates reviewing the new program in summer 1984.

To celebrate the successful conclusion of the two-year revision, Waters organized a special luncheon for faculty and staff. "I wanted to provide a forum for everyone to come to grips with the new requirements and also to foster a sense of community," says Waters, who invited "everyone who had anything to do with student advising by the wildest stretch of the imagination."

A member of the original general education committee described the new requirements in detail. Keynote speaker Mark Curtis, AAC president, provided a national context for the new program and congratulated faculty on their efforts. Says Waters, "We wanted to officially embrace the requirements and to reassure people who were uncomfortable with the new direction that we were part of a process that was happening all around the country."

Concerned that the new program could be perceived as a complicated arrangement of courses, Waters asked graphic designer Brian Larson to "help us translate the abstractions into visual realities." Larson designed advising worksheets and a brochure which describes the requirements. He also devised desk copies of the new requirements so that each faculty member would have an up-to-date version instead of one of the many drafts that had been printed during the revision process. "We felt it was very important to have attractive pieces which showed that we were not only serious about the new program but also very happy and proud of it," says Waters.

Waters admits that the two-year process had some problems. In any type of academic redefinition, he says, participants must deal with the bread and butter issues of "turfdom," as well as the academic questions. As a commuter campus, the faculty also were concerned about their ability to offer enough sections of the new requirements at times convenient for all students.

Previous efforts to revise the general education program had failed because the faculty had been unable to reach concensus. Waters praises Enteman's ability to interact with the faculty and ease the stress that often accompanies institutional change. "The consultants provided a point of external validation," says Waters.

Waters advises others interested in revising their general education program to establish deadlines and approach the process in a slow and cautious manner. By spending a year discussing criteria for each requirement, the committee forced the faculty to seriously examine the purpose of general education. It is also important, says Waters, to publish the criteria for each requirement because chairpersons will challenge the rejection of their courses. He found a word processor useful in preparing the many drafts of the new requirements.

During the second year of the project Waters served as special assistant to the chancellor. By placing one person in charge at the cabinet level, the chancellor signaled that the revision was to be a campus wide project that had his support, says Waters. In addition, the campus and community knew who had accurate answers to questions and rumors.

"Project Lodestar's greatest contribution," says Waters, "was providing a context for thinking about change. Enteman was not an academic carpetbagger who came in with a suitcase full of tricks. Ultimately every campus has to create a general education program that satisfies its own students' needs." *P.B.*

For more information, contact Gregory Waters, Director, Graduate and Special Programs, University of Michigan-Flint, Flint, MI 48503. 312/762-3171.

Bard College

Writing Up A Storm

Each August the freshman class takes over the Bard College campus to participate in the three-week Workshop in Language and Thinking. The mandatory, nonremedial writing program seeks "to improve the writing, reading, and thinking abilities of students at all levels of competency and accomplishment," says Stuart Levine, dean of the college. Since its beginning in 1981

the workshop has attracted national attention from the media and foundations, because the workshop "does something about literacy—which is a national problem that everyone talks about," Levine says. During the first workshop Bard administrators called upon a Lodestar advisory team to assess whether or not the program was actually helping students' writing.

The writing program developed from the realization that "many well-schooled freshmen who can handle language, are completely at a loss as to the relationship between thinking and writing," says Levine. "The skills of freshmen in these areas can and must be improved in order to refine the level of freshman academic accomplishment." Bard College President Leon Botstein adds that "what's unique about this program is that if we ask the students to read a passage from Burke . . . and to write about it, the question is not whether what they have to say is idiotic . . . we want to encourage the will to have the *inner perception*."

The workshop faculty are primarily writers who do not regularly teach at Bard. For six days a week they help students with individual writing problems, bolster confidence in their writing, and try to interest them in serious reading and writing, Levine says. In the workshop's first year the students read, discussed, and wrote about a different topic each week: themselves, da Vinci's Last Supper, and justice. Administrators and instructors have since judged such specific topics as too restrictive, and they now offer a variety of writing themes. The techniques used for teaching writing and thinking have also changed and evolved over the three years, says Levine.

The workshop's approach to teaching writing is partly inspired by Peter Elbow, author of two books on writing and workshop director during the first two years. To help students lose their fear of writing and tap their creativity, Elbow treats them like professional writers. He encourages them to write quickly, without worrying about how they sound, and fine tune later. Elbow helped the other workshop faculty members develop a program that was suited to Bard. The result is not a carbon copy of "the Elbow method," says Levine. "The thinking components—the rendering and thinking of text were not part of Elbow's method," he says.

THE LODESTAR LOOK

The Lodestar advisory team spoke with everyone involved in the program, including students, faculty and administrators. The team viewed the workshop as a "'rough draft' upon which we make comments designed to improve future workshops," says William Enteman, lead Lodestar consultant and provost at Rhode Island College. The Lodestar team also included Richard Pearce, professor of English at Wheaton College (MA); Harold Martin, Dana Professor of the Humanities emeritus, Trinity College (CT); and Zelda Gamson, professor, School of Education, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. When forming a team Enteman sought people who were "from the left and the right of the MLA (Modern Language Association). We had to get a spectrum in there," Enteman says. Peter Elbow is associated with the MLA's left.

In their final report the Lodestar consultants state that the program should continue but that "it is difficult to show that the workshop had significant impact on student writing." The workshop helped the students become more interested and confident in their writing ability, but this was not necessarily the students' biggest problem or concern. The consultants discovered that the instructors were too varied in their approaches to teaching and in the quality of the work they demanded of their students. In some courses, the emphasis on expository writing was almost nonexistant and there was little commitment to careful, analytical writing, according to the consultants' report. The students complained of being under-challenged. The college has acted on the Lodestar team's advice to stress more "hard writing," Levine reports. Besides adding more expository writing, they have improved their grammar and syntax instruction by training six upperclass students to assist as grammar tutors.

The Lodestar evaluators discovered that the instructors were not emphasizing skills students would need in their regular classes, and the regular Bard faculty did not follow up on the workshop teaching. Levine says the team's suggestion to better integrate regular Bard courses and the workshop was "probably the strongest recommendation." He would advise other administrators interested in similar workshops to "involve faculty from the college from the outset—let them design the workshop." The number of participating Bard faculty members has gone from zero to five in 1983. The Lodestar evaluation provided the impetus for more Bard faculty to participate, Levine says.

The question concerning whether the program is improving students' writing may be answered after Bard administrators tabulate the results of the formal research project done in 1983 on pre- and post- test writing skills. Students do clearly benefit from the workshop, and Levine says one of the most important benefits of the Lodestar evaluation was pointing this out. He says, "Lodestar observed that there is an orientation function that is carried out in the workshop—we are doing more than just exposing these young people to writing exercises, we are also somehow orienting them to college work and Bard College specifically." *T.A.*

For more information, contact Stuart Levine, Dean of the College, Bard College, Annandale-on-Hudson, NY 12504. 914/758-6822.

Pace University

Attracting Top Liberal Arts Students

In 1973 Pace University received university status from the New York State Department of Education. This recognition signaled a new stage for the 67-year-old institution, which had been established in 1906 as an accounting school. With its new status, Pace could no longer be simply a collection of professional schools, says

Joseph Houle, dean of Pace's Dyson College of Arts and Sciences. He identifies a strong liberal arts college as an essential ingredient in tying together the various components of a university.

With the 1980-83 Dyson College Plan, Houle set out a strategy for strengthening the liberal arts college in the context of Pace's long-range plans. His primary goals were improving the undergraduate liberal arts curriculum and establishing new graduate liberal arts programs. He listed such intermediary steps as attracting excellent students, producing a publication on the success of Dyson alumni, creating undergraduate research seminars, and hiring more full-time faculty members. In 1981 Pace administrators applied to the Lodestar advisory services for assistance in implementing the Dyson Plan.

AAC approved the application and appointed Willard Enteman, provost at Rhode Island College, as lead consultant. In fall 1981 Enteman met with the president, several vice presidents, and Houle to discuss the project timetable and the type of person who would be appropriate for the advisory team. In selecting consultants Enteman and AAC staff members looked for persons who were familiar with the operation of a large urban university. They chose Roderick French, director of George Washington University's Division of Experimental Programs; Peter Tasch, director of the honors program at Temple University; and Jacquelyn Mattfeld, former president of Barnard College.

In March 1982 Enteman met with the department chairpersons at the Manchester and Manhattan campuses to begin narrowing the project focus. Says Houle: "Bill (Enteman) showed us that there were certain things which had to be done before we could implement the Dyson Plan." On Enteman's advice the Lodestar project objective shifted to how to "attract and retain the best students possible for Dyson College." As noted in the advisory team's final report, "challenging, demanding, and intellectually stimulating students are a critical source of development of liberal arts colleges."

The advisory team visited two campuses in April 1982 to meet with administrators and department chairpersons. They listened to faculty members' concerns and proposed possible solutions. Both Houle and the consultants admit that the university's multicampus structure sometimes hindered consensus among colleagues who had never met their counterparts on the other campuses. In addition, the faculty teaching load—often five or six courses a term—left little time for planning and development outside the formal meetings. Both situations signaled potential problems in achieving the project goals and were reflected in the team's final recommendations.

ATTENTION TO FACULTY AND IMAGE

Several months after the April consultation the team submitted its final recommendations to the Pace administrators. Throughout the report they emphasized how the recommendations could improve academic quality at Dyson and, in turn, at Pace itself. The consultants stressed the importance of developing a positive identity for the college among students, faculty, and potential students. Their recommendations included designing a logo for use on stationery, T-shirts, and banners and publishing a newsletter on topics of specific interest to Dyson students, faculty, and alumni. They also encouraged administrators to raise academic standards and give instructors a greater role in determining academic policies.

Focusing on faculty, the consultants listed three factors which could impede progress toward improving Pace's liberal arts program: the faculty's heavy teaching load, the heavy ratio of service courses to upper level courses, and the large number of adjunct faculty (40 percent on one campus). The latter factor, for example, creates a heavy advising load for the already beleaguered full-time instructors. The "sober" remedy, according to the consultants, is "the systematic increase of the number of full-time faculty members over a period of several years." The intended result is that faculty will "come to see themselves as a community of scholars and teachers facing the tremendous challenge of sustaining and advancing genuine liberal arts education."

The report also discusses the college's new Society of Fellows, an honorary organization for top liberal arts students. Praising the college's development of this activity, they also proposed ideas for ensuring its continued success. These included creating a formal meeting place, inviting fellows' input on selection of faculty associates, and developing special upper division courses for fellows.

Houle calls the recommendations for more full-time faculty the report's bottom line. He is preparing a specific timetable for improving the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty and is considering alternatives to tenure track appointments. He has also appointed faculty committees to study each of the recommendations. By fall 1984 he hopes to establish a representative group of Dyson faculty members drawn from each of the campuses to deal with academic and governance issues.

Although the ideas for a logo and T-shirts "died a quick death," according to Houle, staff members have produced a new promotional booklet. By recounting student and alumni experiences, *The Door to Opportunity* describes the college's programs and activities and illustrates the benefits of a liberal arts education.

In reviewing the Lodestar project Houle says, "There weren't any great surprises in the process or the report. But it was helpful to learn what people outside the university saw as our priorities—Lodestar helped us to see that if we stay the same size we must grow in quality to attract the students we want."

Houle advises others interested in using an advisory service such as Lodestar to be open to whatever happens and accept that you "may not get an answer to the question you started with." He calls the consultants' varied experiences important ingredients in helping the faculty and administrators see all sides of an issue. Although he acknowledges that consultants cannot "turn things around overnight," Houle believes that the process is valuable in the long run. *P.B.*

For more information, contact Joseph E. Houle, Dean, Dyson College of Arts and Sciences, Pace University, Pace Plaza, New York, NY 10038. 212/285-3517.

The University of Wyoming

Restructuring College Honors

With the development of a new general education program, University of Wyoming College of Arts and Sciences administrators recognized a need to also update the college's honors program, which paralleled the old distribution requirements. As leaders of Wyoming's only four-year institution of higher education, they also felt a responsibility for providing a satisfying learning experience for the state's best students, who had in the past expressed misgivings about the honors program. With assistance from Project Lodestar, the campus honors committee developed a new program which provides both the academic coherence and sense of community lacking in the old curriculum, says Janice Harris, director of honors and scholars.

In April 1981 the college applied to Project Lodestar for assistance in restructuring the honors program. Their application noted that college faculty had just approved a new general education program after 18 months of study, and campus commitment to academic excellence was strong. In September AAC approved the application for the 1981-82 academic year; one month later lead consultant David Malone, professor of comparative literature at the University of Southern California, made his first campus visit.

During this initial visit Malone talked with several deans of the college, the honors committee (five faculty members representing the college's divisions), the honors program administrator, and several students involved in honors courses. He learned that the students were sometimes confused about curriculum requirements and their status in the program—a University Scholars program provides four-year scholarships to outstanding Wyoming high school seniors and university undergraduates and allows students outside the college to enroll in honors courses. In addition, the requirements no longer matched the general education program, which now draws courses from such categories as historical traditions and humanistic values and philosophical and ethical systems rather than standard disciplinary divisions.

AAC selected Victor Bhatia, director of the Washington State University honors program, and Richard Cummings, director of the University of Utah honors program, as Malone's advisory team. In January 1982 the three consultants visited the university and met with college deans, the honors committee, students, and honors course instructors. Following their visit they discussed their findings and prepared recommendations for strengthening the college's 20-year-old honors program.

Central to their recommendations was the need to appoint a faculty director of the honors program and develop a more coherent curriculum whose goals are consistent with the new general education program. The advisory team praised the faculty's commitment to educational excellence and urged faculty involvement in developing the new curriculum. They also stressed the importance of building an honors community that would allow excellent students to benefit from association with each other.

TAKING ACTION

The college appointed Harris, an associate professor of English and assistant dean of curriculum, as the honors program director. Harris reviewed various honors program models and attended meetings of the National Collegiate Honors Council, an organization for students and faculty members active in honors programs across the country. Working with the University Scholars committee, the honors committee designed a four-year core curriculum that they believe responds to student and advisory team charges that the old program lacked cohesion; the core is to be implemented one year at a time with the freshman course offered for the first time during the 1983-84 academic year.

Freshmen enroll in Composition and Western Cultures, a two-semester, eight-credit course which surveys western traditions from the Bible to the twentieth century. As sophomores, honors students will learn about nonwestern cultures and the experiences of American minorities in the one-semester Cultural Diversity. The one-semester junior core course, Modes of Understanding, will examine "the extent to which knowledge is constrained by methodology and language," according to a course description. Seniors will complete a research project in their major discipline and attend a colloquium on such current issues as nuclear power or world hunger, which allows them to synthesize skills and knowledge gained in their four years. Additional honors offerings will satisfy the remaining general education requirements. Although instructors are enthusiastic about the new program, Harris admits that faculty support has not been unanimous.

To complement the honors community developed by participation in core courses, Harris revived the inactive honors student committee. Students have designed a variety of extracurricular activities, including weekly brown bag luncheons with campus researchers.

Harris is pleased that honors enrollment has risen more than 53 percent to approximately 186 students in fall 1983. The advisory team had noted that a critical mass of students was necessary to maintain an honors program. The committee recruits students during high school visits and freshman orientations and through mailings to potential applicants.

The committee has not resolved the advisory team's concern with distinguishing between honors program students and university scholars. Says Harris, "We may gradually get a more explicable structure, but right now, having the two programs in tandem means that our strongest students get together in at least one course per year, rather than finding themselves completely identified in their respective colleges."

Harris praises the work of the advisory team. She is especially pleased with their final report, which has been

duplicated "time and time again" for distribution on campus. "It is a very persuasive document," she says, that has proven useful in budget discussions. While the recommendations did not outline a specific curriculum, its guidelines were sufficient for developing a program that was best for the University of Wyoming, emphasizes Harris. *P.B.*

For more information, contact Janice Harris, Director of Honors and Scholars, University of Wyoming, University Station Box 3254, Laramie, WY 82071. 307/766-4106.

University of Tennessee

Making Room for Nontraditional Liberal Arts Programs

Prior to their Lodestar project, University of Tennessee faculty and administrators were examining nontraditional services for students, including liberal arts programs for adults. In early 1981 faculty members working on such projects at the four UT campuses joined together and applied for a Lodestar project to "develop an enlarged definition of liberal learning . . . that can provide the basis for programs that foster competence and growth in students of many ages," says David Holden, associate director of the Center for Extended Learning and coordinator of the Lodestar project. They wanted consultants to first help them decide whether to proceed with new liberal education programs, and then help draw up a philosophy, procedures, and deadlines to meet the campuses' goals.

Faculty members and administrators agreed from the beginning that the new programs should be interdisciplinary. "Structuring the university along department lines tends to prohibit interesting inquiry," says Holden. "Interdisciplinary degrees would also make possible a combination of liberal arts and professional programs." Traditional majors are unsuited to adults who have previous work experience and specific needs, says Holden.

The Lodestar consultants provided information on programs at other schools and standards for assessing prior learning, answered general questions, and acted as a catalyst for change. They were not there to actually implement any new programs, Holden says. The advisory team consisted of lead consultant John Moseley, president emeritus of Austin College; William Maehl, Jr., vice provost for continuing education and public service, University of Oklahoma, Norman; Tom Hickey, professor and director, Health Gerontology Program, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; Harriet Cabell, director, External Degree Program, University of Alabama; and Morris Keeton, director of the Council for the Advancement of Experiential Learning.

The team recommended a number of goals for all the university's liberal education activities. The programs should help students develop their values and skills for work as well as their home lives. To ensure equity for adult learners, students should receive individual academic counseling, particularly concerning course placement and degree competion requirements. The university could save money by using emeritus professors, telecommunications, and computer-assisted instruction, and sharing faculty among campuses. To evaluate the programs and ensure coordination of activities between the campuses, the team recommended establishing a Comprehensive Liberal Education Committee, as well as sponsoring peer reviews and faculty development seminars.

INDIVIDUAL CAMPUS PROJECTS—PLANS AND ACTIONS

The Knoxville campus administration and faculty wanted to decide whether or not they should offer an interdisciplinary, external master's degree. After reviewing similar programs and polling department heads and faculty members, the Lodestar committee decided that there was little student interest and that the quality of work produced in these programs was too often not graduate level. As an alternative, the committee proposed an interdisciplinary program for students on campus that requires 18 hours of coursework in a liberal arts major and an optional nine-hour minor in a professional field. The degree proposal is moving through the university's decision-making process, and Holden says approval is at least a year away.

The Chattanooga Lodestar consultant and interested faculty members and administrators formed a Study of Aging and Society council. They recommended developing an interdisciplinary curriculum that involves older persons and services in the university and surrounding community. As a result of the council's work, the campus began a liberal arts, interdisciplinary course on aging and society in fall 1983. The course's modules can also be taken individually on a non-credit, off-campus basis. Since Lodestar, the council has strengthened Chattanooga's Credit for Prior Learning Program and increased faculty participation in the council.

Discussion at the **Martin** campus focused on whether to continue the external criminal justice degree program; to expand it into a general arts and sciences external degree program; or to replace it with the more general degree. The Lodestar consultant discovered that external degrees are readily accepted by graduate and professional schools and by employers, and that faculty at Martin would support an academically rigorous external degree program. But, she warned that funding may make such a program unfeasible for Martin. To improve the existing external criminal justice degree program, she recommended making the correspondence courses actually contractual learning experiences, so that the students would have a more active role. She suggested that an external bachelor of liberal studies degree would be possible if the Knoxville and Chattanooga faculty members were willing to work with Martin students in their area of expertise and if students could design their own majors.

Revisions in the criminal justice degree will be made, says Holden, on the basis of questionnaires sent to students in summer 1983. Students will report on what they

thought of the program and if they would be willing to pay a yearly fee confirming their continued enrollment in the program. (Losing contact with students has been a problem, says Holden.) Martin administrators may decide to simply fine tune the program, or to develop an external liberal arts degree, which would incorporate the criminal justice external degree.

To coordinate activities between the campuses and prepare funding proposals, the Lodestar committee recommended forming a Committee on Comprehensive Liberal Education. When the Vice President for Academic Affairs proposed this to the four Vice Chancellors for Academic Affairs in November 1982, they said to come back when there is a more substantial proposal, Holden says. "They want to be convinced by the people on their own campuses. There hasn't been enough heat under the kettle to make the water boil," he says.

The Lodestar Project suffered, according to the consultants' final report, because "people were not ready to deal with the substantive issues of liberal leaning." One consultant said, "They seem to understand the suggestions, but they never resurfaced in written planning statements." Holden feels that the consultants had little understanding of how a multi-campus works. "At a liberal arts college, if the president plays stars and stripes everyone stands." At a multi-campus university "you may find five people marching right and five marching left. There's a large diversity in opinions," says Holden. The Lodestar project, according to Holden, was well appreciated by the campuses and taught him the value of understanding your university's decision-making process. "Each school has its own way of getting things from idea to action stage and people in a Lodestar-type project need to be really savvy about that," he says. *T.A.*

For more information, contact David Holden, Associate Director, Center for Extended Learning, 420 Communications and Extension Building, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996-0300. 615/974-5135.

Allentown College of St. Francis de Sales

Evaluating General Education

Since their last major curriculum review, during the 1979-80 academic year, administrators and faculty members at Allentown College of St. Francis de Sales have been looking for on-going methods of evaluating their academic program. Although they had developed approaches for reviewing programs of concentration, they had not found a plan for evaluating their liberal arts program. In spring 1982 Alexander Pocetto, vice president for academic affairs, requested Lodestar assistance in assessing the suitability of two evaluation instruments for "measuring the quality of our general education program."

The evaluation instruments chosen by the Academic Affairs Committee were the objective test of the American College Testing Program's College Outcome Measures Project (COMP) and the College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ) developed by the UCLA Laboratory for Research on Higher Education. In May 1982 experts on both instruments visited Allentown to discuss the administration of the tests and the evaluation of results. The college planned to administer both tests during the 1982-83 academic year.

COMP measures the effectiveness of a liberal arts curriculum in helping students acquire "the knowledge and skills important to functioning effectively in society after graduation," according to an ACT brochure. Using multiple choice questions, the objective test focuses on the process areas of communicating, solving problems, and clarifying values, and the content areas of functioning within social institutions, using science and technology, and using the arts.

The CSEQ concentrates on "the quality of education as measured primarily by the quality of effort put forth by the students," says Pocetto. Students rate their own involvement in such activities as using the library, attending club meetings, and reviewing course materials.

AAC approved the Lodestar application and appointed John Nichols, core curriculum coordinator at Saint Joseph's College, as lead consultant. In September 1982 Nichols and several Allentown administrators established a timeline for the year's activities. The Academic Affairs Committee prepared a contract that listed such objectives as analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of their liberal arts program in comparison to similar institutions and determining what correlation exists between the two evaluation methods.

During the academic year the college administered the two tests to a select group of freshmen and seniors. They chose freshmen who matched with the seniors in the study by comparing college entrance examination scores, major fields of study, and grade point averages.

Recognizing a need for a different approach in evaluating the college's Christian humanism objective, Nichols invited Margaret Earley, coordinator of Alverno College's valuing department, to join the Lodestar advisory team. In October Earley and Nichols met with the Academic Affairs Committee to discuss how to describe the objective as student outcomes.

The committee translated the objective of providing "a clear understanding of both Catholic teaching and the motivation necessary for a sincere belief and commitment to the religious and social mission of the Church" into such outcomes as the ability to "identify and communicate the basic content of the Christian humanist tradition" and "evaluate and critique the relationship between belief and action." The committee also developed special questions for this objective, which were included in the CSEQ.

COMP RESULTS

In May 1983 Dean Whitla, director of Harvard University's Office of Instructional Research and Evaluation, joined Nichols and Earley for another Lodestar visit.

They helped administrators and faculty members analyze the COMP results and proposed preliminary action. For example, seniors showed more gain in the "using arts" category than in others. The consultants discussed what factors might have caused these variations and suggested additional data which could be collected to aid in the analysis of the liberal arts program.

Because the CSEQ scores would not be available until July 1983, AAC granted a project extension. As this issue of *Forum* goes to press, Pocetto has arranged for the three consultants to receive the CSEQ results and discuss their findings with the faculty in October.

Although he admits that the evaluation process has been time-consuming, Pocetto says the results are valuable. For example, the CSEQ revealed that Allentown students use the library more than their peers at other liberal arts colleges which have administered the questionnaire. Pocetto speculates that these results reflect the library's location, resources, and service-oriented staff. This information will be useful, he says, in preparing a recommendation for a new library building.

The evaluation results can also help shape the curriculum, says Pocetto. Faculty members may look at the results and ask, for example, whether or not the college should integrate more quantitative work into their courses. Some instructors have already used the preliminary results in reevaluating their teaching methods.

"These instruments provide reliable data that get the faculty and administration talking about some of the important questions in general education," says Pocetto, who admits that people were originally wary of the evaluation instruments. He plans to recommend to the faculty that the college administer the CSEQ to freshmen and seniors every three years. He has tentatively selected the CSEQ because it provides a broader picture of the college environment, is less expensive, and only takes 50 minutes to complete. *P.B.*

For more information, contact Rev. Alexander T. Pocetto, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Allentown College of St. Francis de Sales, Station Avenue, Center Valley, PA 18034. 215/282-1100.

ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS

Appalachian State University

Creating Faculty Review Procedures

One of the most difficult problems facing department chairpersons is the evaluation of faculty members, concluded participants in a 1981 chairperson workshop at Appalachian State University. Gathered to discuss their mutual concerns, the chairpersons identified a need for professional development in the evaluation process. At their recommendation, the vice chancellor for academic affairs established the Council of Chairs, a policy-recommending organization for the 36 campus chairpersons.

The council reaffirmed the need for standardizing evaluation procedures. In spring 1982 administrators applied to Project Lodestar for assistance in developing a "comprehensive and humanistic approach" to faculty review. Recognizing that the 13 arts and sciences chairpersons presented a more manageable group for carrying out the proposal, the administrators limited the project to the College of Arts and Sciences with the anticipation that the results would be shared with the other colleges. The arts and sciences council selected five chairpersons as the Lodestar steering committee.

In expressing interest in a comprehensive and humanistic approach, the chairpersons wanted to "cover not only scholarship and service, which are easy to evaluate, but also instruction," says George Antone, steering committee leader and department of history chairperson. "We wanted evaluations to use as much information as we can accumulate and be more than just students' evaluation of instruction." They also wanted the evaluation to help faculty members improve their teaching, rather than serve as a punitive device for poor instructors.

AAC approved the application and appointed John Bevan, executive director of the Charleston Higher Educational Consortium, as the lead consultant. The Lodestar advisory team members were Joseph Katz, director of Research for Human Development in Educational Policy at the State University of New York at Stony Brook, and Grace French-Lazovik, director for the evaluation of teaching at the University of Pittsburgh.

In July 1982 Bevan met with the steering committee, vice chancellor, and several deans. In line with ASU's Lodestar application, they decided that workshops for the arts and sciences chairpersons would be the best approach. In September Lazovik and Bevan met with the chairpersons to discuss faculty evaluation instruments and the use of student ratings. Katz and Bevan participated in a second workshop in January 1983. The consultants shared both their experiences and sample evaluation instruments.

During the 1982-83 academic year the chairpersons met monthly on their own to continue discussing procedures and evaluation devices. They shared their drafts with faculty members and chairpersons, and in May 1983 the arts and science council approved their statement on review and evaluation and a faculty review worksheet.

"The annual conference worksheet spells out the major points that need to be discussed during the faculty review," says Antone. "It makes the process easier because all the sensitive aspects of an individual's work are on the sheet." For example, such concerns as materials used in the instructional program, intellectual tasks set for students, student ratings, and concern for instructional process appear under the heading Teaching Effectiveness.

Antone emphasizes that the evaluation procedure is just as important as the instrument. ASU chairpersons interview each faculty member twice a year. Antone reports that arts and science chairpersons have begun using the new worksheet. In addition, he has been invited to discuss the Lodestar results with the School of Business chairpersons.

In conjunction with the Lodestar project, a faculty committee is designing a standardized faculty evaluation form for students while chairpersons develop the procedures. In the past departments used their own forms and procedures. Antone anticipates that each course will be evaluated only every two or

three years. By eliminating semester reviews of all courses, the chairpersons hope students will take the process more seriously.

Based on his Lodestar experiences, Antone stresses the importance of organizing all meetings well in advance; keeping the lines of communication open between consultants, chairpersons, and faculty members; and apprising all participants of their responsibilities. Although ASU's application called for four workshops, only two were held because of scheduling and communication problems.

Antone also recommends that administrators involve faculty members in the consultation process at the proposal stage. ASU instructors were understandably concerned when they heard that the chairpersons were devising new evaluation procedures. With the trend toward merit raises, Antone emphasizes the importance of objective, organized evaluations and urges his colleagues to consider which system would best serve their campus. *P.B.*

For more information, contact George Antone, Chairperson, Department of History, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC 28608. 704/262-2282.

Augsburg College

Making Room For Making Changes

Augsburg College faces problems common to many colleges these days: increased competition for liberal arts students and increased costs, as well as a governance system that appears inefficient and unequal to hard working faculty members. Against this backdrop of internal and external problems, the Lodestar advisory team helped Augsburg administrators decide how the college should change its governance structure to better handle long range planning and solve immediate problems, says Richard Green, dean and vice president for academic affairs.

The Lodestar team consisted of John Moseley, president emeritus, Austin College and senior partner of Management and Renewal Consulting Services; and Glenn Bucher, Lincoln Professor of Religion at The College of Wooster. The graduate and marketing task force consultants were Barbara MacEachern, director of Graduate Liberal Studies at Connecticut Wesleyan, and William Elliott, vice president for enrollment planning at Carnegie-Mellon University. Lodestar evaluators visited the campus six times, beginning in August 1981, to discuss with committees, individual faculty members, and administrators how to improve the college's current planning and decision-making processes.

As a result of the Lodestar project, the college has instituted a marketing committee, composed of board of regents members, administrators, and faculty members, that is actively involved in using marketing techniques to publicize the college and seek students, Green says. They conducted a marketing survey of faculty members, alumni, prospective students, and church constituents that changed their previous approach. The survey revealed that mothers should be targeted by admissions because they have a significant influence on what colleges their children attend. The study also showed that admissions needs to emphasize Augsburg's financial aid opportunities, to correct the prevailing impression among potential students that aid is difficult to obtain.

The Lodestar team recommended that the president and board take a more active role in the college's academic planning process. Green reports that the board did become more interested in the college's future plans, and some members joined planning committees. The president participates in the Program Review Committee, a group that suggests changes in keeping with new enrollment figures.

The faculty has complained that the committee system needs streamlining and that problem solving must involve "more action and less talk," reports Green. The faculty senate did reduce its number from 16 to 12 members, but they have not made any other significant changes, Green says. They hope to complete reviewing and streamlining the committees by 1984, after the administration has implemented changes in the governance system.

The Lodestar consultants made suggestions for changing the governance system that the president is likely to offer the faculty and board of regents in fall 1983, and that Green expects will be approved by November 1983. These recommendations include making the college planning council, which is now primarily an advisory group to the president, more formal and including board members. The responsibility for decision-making in general should be better distributed throughout the administration, according to the Lodestar team. One of the most important Lodestar recommendations, says Green, is "to tie budget considerations to the planning process. Currently budget and long range planning are totally separate." The consultants suggested that the administration rewrite the college's mission statement, but this will have to follow the completion of the market survey follow-up, the review of current programs, and the revision of the governance system, Green says.

Green advises other administrators working with consultants to build the faculty members' trust and interest in the consultants from the beginning. His major stumbling block at first was "convincing the faculty that bringing in consultants was a good idea. Once that occurred things moved fairly rapidly." He also warns against getting sidetracked by other problems that arise. "It's difficult remembering that your goal is to drain the swamp while you're trying to get the alligators out too . . . we've had a lot of alligators." *T.A.*

For more information, contact: Richard Green, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Augsburg College, 731 21st Avenue South, Minneapolis, MN 55454. 612/330-1024.

College of Mount Saint Vincent

Uniting — And Strengthening — The Humanities

"The past ten years have shown a 42 percent decline in students majoring in the liberal arts at the College of Mount Saint Vincent," the college's Lodestar application begins. To reverse this trend faculty members and administrators decided to strengthen the humanities departments and establish an *esprit de corps* by merging seven departments into a Humanities Division. The merger had been in the planning stages for two years, when, in fall 1982, Lodestar consultants worked with the humanities faculty members and Kathleen Knowles, academic dean, to put the final touches on the transition.

The Lodestar consultants recommended forming faculty committees to study the issues of leadership, curriculum, general education courses, faculty development, and public relations for the new division. The consultants were as director, Glenn Bucher, Lincoln Professor of Religion at the College of Wooster; William Downard, academic dean at St. Joseph's Col-

lege (IN), and Bruce Haywood, president of Monmouth College. During the committee meetings the consultants "acted like a good psychiatrist and instead of just offering advice let the faculty clarify their thoughts," says Knowles. "The faculty felt the changes came from them." The team members also spoke with each humanities faculty member who was opposed to the change and, as a result, most of the faculty are now supporters, according to Knowles.

The classics, English, fine arts, foreign languages, history, philosphy, and religious studies departments merged to become the Humanities Division. A director, elected by the faculty, replaced the department chairpersons. Three humanities faculty committees on academic, faculty development, and public relations issues assist the director in decision making.

As part of the new division, faculty members and Lodestar consultants developed a 12 credit Humanities Honors Sequence, titled The Art of Seeing, Thinking, and Expressing, for freshman honors students. In their first semester the students study literature and writing with fine arts professors. In the second semester they focus on philosophy, history, and religion. In fall 1984 all humanities majors will be required to take a 12 credit sequence, in addition to their 18 hours of required general education courses. The sequence, tentatively entitled Private Conscious Public Actions, will explore philosophy, religion, and history through literature.

One of the goals of the Humanities Division is to help develop writing skills, thus each new course will have a writing component. In the new honors sequence a writing instructor attends all classes, meets once a week with all the students to discuss the writing assignments, and once a week with each individual student.

Knowles had hoped to develop cooperative academic programs between the Humanities Division and Manhattan College, an activity already established with Mount Saint Vincent's science departments. This attempt has so far been unsuccessful. "We decided to first worry about what's happening at home," Knowles says. "We have to prove ourselves and show some results before they'll become part of it." One determent is that both colleges have decreasing enrollments of humanities students and fear losing students to the other college.

Having only one chairperson, thereby freeing up faculty for teaching, and streamlining the budget processes are clear advantages of the new division. Relinquishing their budgets was difficult for the faculty, Knowles says, but lengthy discussions convinced them of the advantages. To contribute to the *esprit de corps*, all the humanities faculty members have agreed to move into new offices located in one building in summer 1984.

Knowles advises others interested in making such a change to get an objective evaluator, such as a Lodestar team, to point out problems and to help convince faculty. But she warns of rushing into any plan of action and advocates extensive discussion before calling in the consultants. *T.A.*

For more information, contact Margaret Higgins, Director, Humanities Division, College of Mount Saint Vincent, 263rd Street & Riverdale Avenue, Bronx, NY 10471. 212/549-8000.

College of St. Catherine

Planning Departmental Reviews

Because reviews of liberal arts departments are particularly difficult (there are no uniform standards or outside groups that accredit, for example, English departments), administrators at the College of St. Catherine requested a Lodestar advisory team to help them decide how to improve their liberal arts disciplines. Anita Pampusch, vice president and academic dean, says, "I didn't want us only to do reviews when something was forcing us, such as retrenchment. The results might have more implications than just improving quality."

Soon after the Lodestar project began, the consultants advised the college to implement departmental evaluations only as part of a college-wide evaluation. "It's not good for an institution to have only one part examining itself," Pampusch discovered. The consultants and Pampusch decided to focus the Lodestar project on developing a plan for reviewing the liberal arts programs while identifying problems that would be the concern of an institutional review. They also discussed techniques which are useful to a college-wide review.

When developing a review process, administrators should clarify the review's purpose and subject, and the criteria for assessing programs, the consultants said. The consultants invited administrators from Furman University and Hood College to discuss their evaluation methods in light of St. Catherine's needs. The consultants summarized their four major recommendations in a final report: A department and program review is necessary for maintaining excellence and making changes. A review system requires personnel and financial support from the college, as well as time from the faculty involved. "Lack of cooperation, suspicion, past experience with a review process, and timidity" can undermine a review process that is not done systematically. Last but not least, department and program reviews need to be part of institution-wide planning and evaluation.

The Lodestar team made their recommendations after numerous campus visits and discussions with faculty members, administrators, and committee members. They also studied a 1979-80 Educational Policies Committee review of all the programs, which helped them to foresee possible pitfalls and advantages of future reviews. The two lead consultants were Glenn Bucher, Lincoln Professor of Religion at the College of Wooster, and John Moseley, president emeritus of Austin College and senior partner of Management and Renewal Consulting Service. Assisting the lead consultants were Christine Young, provost and academic dean at Hood College, and G. Melvin Hipps, head librarian at Dallas Baptist College.

In 1982, as a result of the Lodestar project, the president initiated a Strategic Long-Range Planning Project. The faculty and administrators working on the project will develop an institution-wide planning process, into which the departmental review will fit, says Pampusch. "We will rely very seriously on the Lodestar report and incorporate most of what they said," she says. The institution-wide review will probably be on a four- or five-year cycle, and the review committee will examine a separate area each year. Some of the areas they will study are academic departments, fundraising and development, and finances. Administrators have not yet decided on a specific review process. They have been focusing on enrollment and budget problems while "the more theoretical projects which we know we have to do get set aside," Pampusch says. In August 1983 they held a Strategic Planning retreat, and Pampusch proposed making evaluation and planning a priority for 1983-84 academic year.

To avoid having to revamp a proposal after the project's initiation, Pampusch advices talking early on with the consultants about the project's feasibility. Administrators and faculty members working on evaluation and long-range planning projects should also "have a clear sense of where their college wants to go. An evaluation is a tool to achieve your goals and cannot exist independently of a sense of mission." *T.A.*

For more information, contact Anita Pampusch, CSJ, Vice President and Academic Dean, The College of St. Catherine, 2004 Randolph Avenue, St. Paul, MN 55105. 612/690-6500.

Davidson College

New Insights on Established Courses

Since 1963 an interdisciplinary humanities program for freshmen and sophomores at Davidson College has received high praise from alumni, reports T. C. Price Zimmermann, vice president for academic affairs. The two-year course, which attracts approximately one-third of the students, examines the development of Western civilization from ancient near east cultures to the present. Although the course continues to be popular, recent students have complained about the amount of reading, which has grown over the years, and the disunity of materials. With assistance from a Project Lodestar advisory team during the 1982-83 academic year, faculty members reviewed the program.

"Our challenge," says Zimmermann, "was to make a good course outstanding by taking a fresh look at it." Zimmermann admits that the program had become overcrowded as faculty members added their favorite materials. Significant themes were being submerged in the quantity of readings, he says, and the course had become more multidisciplinary, rather than interdisciplinary.

In addition, Zimmermann was having trouble recruiting instructors. Each year 14 faculty members drawn from a variety of disciplines lead small group discussion sessions, which are complemented by lectures for all class members. Younger faculty members want to teach courses which they have helped design, says Zimmermann. He was also concerned about the lack of continuity between the program's two years, which each have a separate staff.

In September 1982 Lodestar lead consultant Harold Martin, Dana Professor of the Humanities emeritus at Trinity College (CT), spoke with program chairpersons, instructors, and students. Administrators next set up a liaison committee which included one senior and one junior faculty member from each year of the program. In December the committee met with Martin and Lodestar consultants Marvin Levich, professor of philosophy and humanities at Reed College, and Theodore K. Rabb, professor of history at Princeton University.

Following their visit the consultants submitted a detailed report of their findings and suggestions for changes. Says Zimmerman: "The report elicted a strong reaction. Some greeted it with skepticism, others with enthusiasm. But once the dust settled, there was a general consensus that the course needed to change."

During summer 1983 six faculty members received special support to devise a new approach for the course. Drawing from the consultants' report, their recommendations included organizing materials by themes within the historical context, integrating the development of writing skills, and emphasizing connections between both years' topics. Students will explore such themes as the individual and the community and the search for self. By focusing on specific cities in the ancient world and in the 16th century, for example, instructors will be able to provide an integrated examination of each period's art, literature, and philosophy. The program culminates with seminars which explore contemporary issues in light of the insights gained from studying past civilizations.

Zimmermann has applied to the National Endowment for the Humanities for funds to prepare instructors to teach in the new program, tentatively scheduled for implementation in fall 1985. He is enthusiastic about the program's increased emphasis on writing and plans to conduct summer institutes on the teaching of writing.

Zimmermann stresses the importance of using consultants to give a fresh perspective on internal situations. "As a means for inducing change the consultants' visit was an unqualified success," says Zimmermann, who was not bothered that some people disagreed with the consultants' report. "It's good to have a little controversy to break through complacency. The history of American education was not a smooth process—academic communities are very volatile when it comes to things in which they have an intense concern." *P.B.*

For more information, contact T. C. Price Zimmermann, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Davidson College, Davidson, NC 28036. 704/892-2000.

Emmanuel College

Faculty and Microcomputers

During the pilot phase of a new freshman course that introduces composition, logic, mathematics, and computer science, Emmanuel College administrators recognized a need for greater faculty understanding of the use of microcomputers in humanities. Formally introduced for all freshmen in fall 1982, the year-long Cognitive Foundations for the Liberal Arts takes a thematic approach to skills development; themes have included women in modern society and world population and hunger.

Faculty members use computer-assisted instruction in both semesters. In addition, instructors schedule computer time for each student at the academic resources center. Students use the microcomputers for drills and "become familiar with computers as tools," says Marion Kilson, academic dean.

In spring 1982 administrators applied to Project Lodestar for assistance in familiarizing faculty members with the potential applications of microcomputers in humanities. They were especially interested in exploring how microcomputers could be used to better advantage in the composition segments of Cognitive Foundations. Faculty members teach the course at three different skills levels because of the disparities in freshman preparation. The administrators hoped that the Lodestar consultants would suggest more sophisticated use of microcomputers at the advanced composition level.

AAC approved the proposal and appointed Evan Collins, former president of the State University of New York at Albany, as lead consultant. After talking with campus administrators, Collins invited Delores Burton, professor of English at Boston University; Randall L. Jones, professor of German at Brigham Young University; and Joseph Raben, editor of *Computers and the Humanities* and professor of English at Queens College of the City University of New York to serve on the Lodestar advisory team.

As an introduction to microcomputers, the campus Lodestar committee sponsored a fall faculty workshop with the Lodestar consultants. Prior to the workshop the coordinator of the academic computer center gave a microcomputer demonstration. The workshop opened with a panel discussion on the pedagogical uses of microcomputers in the humanities. The consultants next led separate sessions for faculty in foreign languages; the Cognitive Foundations' composition-logic semester; and theological studies, philosophy, history, and English.

During spring 1983 the computer center coordinator offered faculty workshops in word processing, hardware, and programming. The former was extremely popular and will be offered again during the January semester break. The coordinator is also helping individual faculty members develop programs for specific courses. In addition, administrators provide faculty development funds for the study of computer applications in the disciplines.

Although Kilson calls the Lodestar project a "catalyst for a number of faculty activities," she admits that the consultation did not result in changes on campus or in Cognitive Foundations. She reports that while some of the consultants' expertise differed from what they had anticipated, their presence validated internal changes. During fall 1983 a consultant is reviewing the mathematics segment of Cognitive Foundations. Kilson speculates that this review could change how microcomputers are used in the course.

Kilson recommends generating interest in microcomputers by appealing to faculty members' self-interests. She describes the microcomputer's word processing capabilities as an attractive incentive. *P.B.*

For more information, contact Marion Kilson, Academic Dean, Emmanuel College, 400 The Fenway, Boston, MA 02115. 617/277-9340.

Ithaca College

Faculty Members as Liberal Learners

Founded nearly 100 years ago as a music conservatory, Ithaca College now includes schools of allied health professions, business, communications, humanities and science, and health, physical education, and recreation. Although administrators view the professional offerings as important facets of the undergraduate program, they also stress the necessity of acquiring a well-rounded education. In 1980, after several years of study and moderately successful efforts to integrate professional and liberal studies, administrators focused on faculty development as the key to strengthening liberal education at Ithaca. Their 1981 Project Lodestar application asked for assistance in "the renewal of faculty members themselves as liberal learners."

AAC approved the application and appointed Evan Collins, former president of the State University of New York at Albany, as lead consultant. William Nelsen, president of Augustana College, and Bradley Dewey, dean of the faculty at Franklin and Marshall College, completed the advisory team.

During the 1981-82 academic year the consultants visited Ithaca three times to meet with the provost, deans, and an ad hoc committee on faculty development. The committee was developing a comprehensive faculty development plan; in addition to the Lodestar focus on liberal learning, they were examining the faculty's role as teachers and specialists. "We looked to the consultants for their experiences on the kinds of development opportunities faculty members want and how best to provide these opportunities," says Eloise Blanpied, assistant to the provost.

Working with the consultants, the committee prepared recommendations for faculty development in liberal learning. Their recommendations center on financial support for faculty members' individual, group, and extracurricular projects. They suggested, for example, that individual projects might include independent research, coursework in new areas, or study with experts in different fields. Group projects might include examination of particular themes or development of interdisciplinary courses. The recommendations emphasize that, unlike other faculty development activities which result in a tangible product, Lodestar projects strive for the more nebulous goal of "contributing to the renewal of individual faculty members as liberal learners." The committee also suggested that a standing committee be appointed to review proposals and develop additional ideas.

During the 1982-83 academic year administrators allocated $10,000 for the "Lodestar Program," which is now listed in a booklet on faculty development opportunities. The committee reviewed six preliminary proposals and funded three. Activities included a group project by musicians, poets, dancers, and artists, who coordinated a program of poetry, original music, and choreography to illustrate the collaborative creative process. An allied health professions instructor attended a conference on medical ethics and developed faculty seminars on that topic.

To further expand faculty awareness of the Lodestar concept, the committee is coordinating a series of evening gatherings. One meeting featured faculty members' research on Kentucky coal miners, while another explored the effect of gender on mathematical studies. Early during the project the committee also sponsored a reception to introduce colleagues to the Lodestar consultation and solicit their suggestions.

Blanpied credits Project Lodestar with providing the necessary recognition and commitment for making these activities possible. "We have always been committed to liberal learning," she says, "but then we are committed to a lot of things. Lodestar made the commitment official and gave us specific deadlines." *P.B.*

For more information, contact Dana Wilson, Assistant Professor, School of Music, Ithaca College, Ithaca, NY 14850. 607/274-3175.

Marymount College

Building A Core

The distribution requirements at Marymount College, a women's college, were so loose and the major requirements so abundant that "students in one major were unable to communicate with the majority of students in other majors," says Elisa Carrillo, academic dean. To ensure that students have a common learning experience and a strong liberal arts background, the faculty and administration began planning a core curriculum in 1979. In 1982, when they had almost completed the curriculum project, the administrators applied to Project Lodestar for assistance in sounding out their ideas and fine tuning their plans.

The curriculum they wanted to change required students to take, at any time during their four years, a total of six or seven courses from four divisions: humanities, fine arts, social sciences, and natural sciences. The students chose from a large selection of courses loosely defined as liberal education courses by the department heads, says Carrillo. Faculty advisers were to ensure that the students had a balance of professional or semi-professional and liberal arts courses, but the selection was so broad that this was not successfully enforced, Carrillo says.

With help from Lodestar consultants during the last nine months of their revision, the General Education Committee, consisting of faculty, students, and one administrator, devised a more structured general education curriculum that began fall 1983. The new curriculum includes three, three-credit, core courses: The Ancient and Medieval Worlds; The Renaissance Through the Eighteenth Century; and The Modern World (Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries). These courses are interdisciplinary and incorporate women's and non-western civilization studies. To ensure that students develop both liberal education and professional skills, all students also take 16 credits of distribution requirements, including two courses in a foreign language, two in natural science, one course in fine arts, and one in social science. Freshmen take fifteen credits in basic skills courses in mathematics, computers, and composition.

The faculty approved the committee's proposal with surprising speed, and Carrillo credits the Lodestar consultants with

generating enthusiasm. The consultants were Carol Guardo, provost, the University of Hartford, and Sue Rosser, associate professor, Mary Baldwin College. Some of their suggestions included clarifying the task of the three faculty members designing the curriculum; making the project's timetable less ambitious; and examining the general education curriculum as a whole before looking at the parts. Most importantly, says Carrillo, the consultants advised them to ensure faculty and administrators in the professional departments that the general education requirements would not water down their majors.

Carrillo says she encountered few problems and even some of the Lodestar consultants' advice proved unnecessary. The faculty have been supportive of the changes, the timetable has been manageable, and the distribution of the work went smoothly. The faculty teaching the core courses, which are the only new courses, will be rotated and their regular classes offered on an every other year basis. The General Education Committee must still determine placement requirements for some courses. Computer literacy course placement is particularly difficult because freshmen have a wide range of computer experience. Faculty must also decide on course materials for the core courses and find more literature on women in ancient times and in non-western cultures.

Carrillo says communication and compromise are the important features of a successful general education project. "Dialogue is extremely important. You have to be willing to talk to everyone and also to compromise. If you take the all or nothing approach, you get nothing." *T.A.*

For more information, contact Elisa Carrillo, Academic Dean, Marymount College, Neperan Road, Tarrytown, NY 10591, 914-631-3200, ext. 298.

Mater Dei College

Liberal Arts Goals

Established in 1960, Mater Dei College is a two-year coeducational institution which offers associate degrees in such areas as criminal justice and social work. With assistance from a Project Lodestar advisory team, an ad hoc committee reviewed the college's associate of arts degree in liberal studies, proposed a new mission statement for the program, and developed a list of required courses.

In their spring 1982 Lodestar application administrators sought assistance in developing a baccalaureate degree in liberal studies. A year earlier they had requested permission from the New York State Department of Education to offer four-year degrees in social work and nursing. After reviewing Mater Dei's application, education department officials had expressed concern about the college's liberal arts and science program. Administrators hoped the Lodestar consultants could help develop a baccalaureate degree in liberal studies.

AAC approved the application and appointed Albert J. Hamilton, dean of the School of Arts and Sciences at Manhattan College, as the Lodestar lead consultant. By the time Hamilton made his initial visit to the campus in September 1982, Mater Dei administrators had withdrawn their baccalaureate degree application for "financial reasons," says Beth Reynolds, associate professor of mathematics. The project focus shifted to how the college's associate of arts degree in liberal studies might be improved, according to Reynolds.

During his first visit Hamilton met with the academic and liberal arts committees. Discussions focused on the goals of the liberal arts program and the need for coordinating it with the learning skills center's activities. Reynolds reports that Mater Dei has a large number of nontraditional students who require remedial assistance. Many pursue a liberal arts degree and begin their college careers with remedial work in English, mathematics, and other liberal arts subjects.

After the initial consultation administrators appointed Reynolds chairperson of an ad hoc committee charged with reviewing the liberal studies degree. In December Hamilton and Robert A. Grinchuk, dean of Wheeling College, visited the college for further discussions. Following this meeting, Hamilton prepared a letter outlining a suggested course of action for the committee. These included preparing a goal statement for the liberal arts program, reviewing program requirements, and designing a required freshman seminar that would introduce students to liberal learning and help develop their critical thinking skills.

During spring 1983 the Lodestar committee developed the program philosophy and a list of proposed requirements. Their work had included evaluating students' needs, considering the possibility of team teaching, and investigating the role of developmental studies in liberal education. The suggested program philosophy, according to their final report, "reflects our contention that the world we live in has a constantly changing demand for new technologies and seeks specialists in a wide variety of areas here today and obsolete tomorrow." Suggested program requirements include coursework in foreign languages and computer science, in addition to traditional distribution requirements and the freshman seminar. In June Hamilton met with the committee to review their suggestions.

Recognizing the importance of developing students' critical thinking skills, the committee sponsored an August workshop for liberal arts faculty members to discuss how these skills can be developed in different subjects. Hamilton invited Stephen O'Neill, assistant professor in the department of special educational services at the City University of New York Bronx Community College, to lead the workshop. Faculty members were very interested in the topic, says Reynolds, who speculates that the freshman seminar (tentatively titled Introduction to Higher Education) could become a campus-wide requirement.

During fall 1983 the Lodestar committee has discussed their ideas with the liberal arts committee. They will next share their recommendations with the academic committee. With approval from this committee, the changes could be implemented by fall 1984 at the earliest, says Reynolds. Another plan is to expand the new philosophy into a list of specific goals and objectives for the liberal arts program. *P.B.*

For more information, contact Beth Reynolds, Assistant Professor, Mater Dei College, Riverside Drive, Ogdensburg, NY 13669, 315-393-5930.

Merrimack College

Maximizing the Faculty and Curriculum

In the face of future enrollment decreases, Merrimack College decided to seek assistance in deciding the best use of their faculty and the best organization of their government and curriculum. The college administrators decided to take a strategic planning, as opposed to long-term, approach to their Lodestar project. Their self-examination had the goal of outlining ways to make immediate changes, says President John Deegan. Past planning projects suffered from too much talk and not enough action, Deegan reports.

Lead consultant Willard Enteman, provost at Rhode Island

College, outlined in November 1982 a strategy for beginning to analyze the college's internal organization and their student pool. A steering committee for planning, made up of students, faculty members, alumni, staff, and administrators, formed subcommittees in December to work on mission, finances, facilities, academic planning, curricular planning, personnel, and enrollment. In spring meetings the subcommittees met with Enteman and the two other Lodestar consultants, Robert Strider, former president of Colby College, and George Hazzard, former president of Worcester Polytechnic Institute.

The consultants and committees decided on a variety of actions that the college has begun to take. Deegan set up a committee of faculty and staff members, students, alumni, and administrators to "better focus the mission statement and the academic program," he says. The committee will recommend in fall 1983 that the college focus on the local, as opposed to national, applicant pool. The college should also structure the curriculum to reaffirm the college's Catholic identity and committment to providing professional programs within the context of a broad liberal arts education.

To fulfill these recommendations, the college will, for example, stress computer literacy and communication skills, and increase their continuing education credit and noncredit courses. Deegan hopes to develop three new projects: management training programs for local industry personnel; summer computer camps for high school students; and a national workshop on Willa Cather, directed by a faculty member who is a leading expert on Cather. The other programs will be taught by existing faculty members.

The college hired two (non-Lodestar) consultants to review the college's government structure during the 1983-84 academic year. The consultants are meeting with all groups on campus and should have a report on the college's organizational structure by December and on the government structure by spring 1984. They are also meeting with the Board of Trustees to discuss the board's self-study and presidential assessment. Deegan says he has also hired a "more professional" student services staff, who will work on improving everything from financial aid to student housing.

In keeping with the Lodestar team's recommendations, staff members are improving the endowment and gift program by updating files, increasing the amount of follow-up, and developing plans for a capital fund campaign. These efforts have already resulted in increased funds, Deegan says. Deegan also meets regularly with a council of business leaders. They advise him on how to maximize corporate giving and help him establish connections between the college and businesses. The committee studying ways to improve enrollment and tuition income is slightly behind schedule due to staff changes, but they will have a report ready in fall 1983, Deegan says.

The Lodestar consultants and Deegan agree that the project suffered from not moving fast enough. Just getting the planning process begun was the most difficult, says Deegan. He regrets not having done some preliminary work before the consultants arrived, but getting people motivated required the consultants' encouragement and objective perspective. The faculty were wary because past planning projects had minimal results, and they feared that organizational changes during a period of declining enrollments would mean loss of jobs or turf, Deegan says. Also, the administration's desire to involve a wide variety of college personnel kept the project grounded at first.

Deegan reports that faculty morale has improved because the movement and changes they desired are being made. They also recognize that by being involved in the planning process they can protect their interests. Deegan advises other administrators undertaking strategic planning to begin the project by educating the faculty about what will happen and the nature of planning. "The administration knows what planning is and understand planning, but the faculty are interested in teaching." *T.A.*

For more information, contact Rev. John Deegan, O.S.A., President, Merrimack College, North Andover, MA 01845, 617 638-7111.

Seton Hall University

Integrating Computers and Humanities

Anticipating the arrival of an increasing number of computer-wise students, Seton Hall University administrators applied to Project Lodestar in spring 1982 for assistance in integrating computers into their humanities program. "In the next two or three years we are going to see freshmen who are terrifically sophisticated about computers," says Peter Ahr, associate dean. "If the faculty are still pushing quill pens, we will lose our academic legitimacy."

Prior to the Lodestar application the College of Arts and Science dean organized a computer task force. After surveying faculty members, the task force recognized a need for expert advice in choosing equipment and using computers in humanities courses. They also thought that computer literacy could best be achieved by integrating computers wherever possible instead of offering one required computer course.

AAC asked Joseph Raben, editor of *Computers and the Humanities*, to serve as the Lodestar lead consultant during the 1982-83 academic year. Raben, who is also professor of English at Queens College of the City University of New York, first talked with the task force about their interests and determined what type of expertise was needed. Says Ahr: "We were starting from ground zero and wanted to know what was available and what could be accomplished."

To familiarize the task force with various computer applications, Raben invited Michael Arensen, associate professor of music at the University of Delaware, to describe his work with computer-assisted instruction on the PLATO system. In addition, a representative from World Book Encyclopedias discussed a microcomputer version of the encyclopedia which allows for on-line searches.

In October the task force coordinated a faculty development day. Arensen and Randall L. Jones, professor of German at Brigham Young University, demonstrated computer instruction in music and language, respectively. Although the workshop provided a good introduction to computers, it also revealed a certain disinterest on the part of faculty members, says Ahr. He now recognizes the necessity of having computers in place so that faculty members can immediately begin experimenting with them. During fall 1983 additional mainframe terminals and a dozen personal computers are being installed around campus for faculty use.

"Developing faculty interest also takes some active pushing by the administration," says Ahr. "No one is going to play with computers instead of writing a book if they think it will jeopardize their promotion or tenure." Ahr also advises providing intensive lessons for faculty members in each discipline or subdiscipline rather than trying to reach all faculty at once, although he notes that a large workshop is effective in emphasizing the administration's commitment to computers.

With the installation of more computers, Ahr hopes to arrange for additional consultation assistance in specific disciplines. The university will continue to encourage faculty participation in off-campus workshops on computer use in their disciplines. Says Ahr: "The visibility of the hardware and the demonstration by colleagues of its usefulness makes an impression on people. They realize it might be worthwhile for them."

Ahr speculates that in the next five years most students will arrive on campus with their own computers, and the university will loan them the necessary software. He notes that Seton Hall's science, mathematics, social science, and business instructors already use computers in their courses and anticipates little computer anxiety among humanities students. "If things work out properly," says Ahr, "our graduates will have spent hundreds of hours on computers by the time they leave here." *P.B.*

For more information, contact Peter G. Ahr, Associate Dean, Seton Hall University, 400 South Orange Ave., South Orange, NJ 07079. 201/761-9380.

Widener University

General Education for Professionals

With approximately 80 percent of their students majoring in areas other than the arts and sciences, Widener University administrators and faculty members recognize the need for strong general education requirements. The existing requirements, developed in the early 1970s, take the "smorgasbord approach," ensuring breadth but not depth, says Joseph Arbuckle, assistant provost. In 1981, with the help of a Lodestar evaluating team, faculty members and administrators developed general education requirements that include more advanced classes but the same number of courses. They hope to implement these changes by fall 1984.

Presently, students choose 12 hours of courses from each of the arts and sciences categories: humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. These distribution requirements "are inadequate in promoting a truly liberal education experience for undergraduate students," says Joel Rodney, former dean of the college and now vice president of academic affairs at Salisbury State College. Students should be "exposed to and be made thoroughly conversant with the underlying methodology of the social sciences, natural sciences, and humanities, and be made aware of their cultural, aesthetic, and intellectual heritage," Rodney says.

The university's general education committee met with the Lodestar advisory team three times during the 1981-82 academic year, as well as additionally with individual members. The team consisted of lead consultant Evan Collins, former president of the State University of New York at Albany; John Nichols, core curriculum coordinator at St. Joseph's College; and David Wee, professor of English at St. Olaf College.

As a result of Lodestar, the general education committee will recommend to faculty in fall 1983 that one of the students' three required courses in each liberal arts category be an advanced course. Faculty members in each field will decide what constitutes an advanced course. The general education committee also recommends dividing each category into two divisions and requiring students to take a course in each. The social science courses will be divided into behavioral and political; natural sciences into math and science; and humanities into English and "everything else." The committee will also recommend that the mathematics and English skills classes become graduation, instead of general education, requirements.

With the exception of the natural science area, the faculty members will not develop new courses for the general education program, but rather select from already available courses. To structure advanced science courses that require few prerequisites, the committee will recommend using a chemistry professor's approach as a model. In the first course he presents basic concepts with few mathematical components; he then expands these concepts in the second course, Arbuckle says.

The Lodestar team offered the committee advice on its proposals, rather than presenting them with a plan of action. "As things came up that tied directly into their experience they let us know what worked for them," says Arbuckle. "They were not going to give us a plan—we had to come up with that." The team recognizes that the changes made are significant, but they had set their sights higher. "I would push harder for lengthier consideration of more innovative changes," Nichols says. He recommended that the university offer new, interdisciplinary general education courses that extend from junior to senior years and connect in their content and approach. Arbuckle says an integrated general education plan could not be fully implemented at Widener because the students' interests vary too widely. The school is also wary of interdisciplinary courses as a result of previous experiences. The number of requirements most students have for their majors, particularly in the School of Engineering, negates the possibility of increasing the number of general education requirements, says Arbuckle. The students' schedules already force them to spread their general education courses over four years.

Arbuckle regrets being unable to implement the general education changes earlier, but in the last two years "virtually all faculty time was spent on a university-wide governance project and the education distribution requirements took a back seat." Although he will now have to rejuvinate faculty interest, he anticipates the faculty will again support the proposal. Arbuckle recommends making general education improvements a priority item: "Force yourself to set a deadline and get it started. It's not difficult; it's just a matter of doing it." *T.A.*

For more information, contact Joseph Arbuckle, Assistant Provost, Widener College, Chester, PA 19103. 215/499-4107.

CORRECTION: The cost for institutional membership in the National Collegiate Honors Council was incorrectly listed in the October 1983 issue. The correct fee is $80. For more information contact Lothar Tresp, Executive Secretary/Treasurer, 302 Academic Building, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602. 404/542-1050.